

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Applicant and the undersigned wish to thank Examiner Ledynh for the courtesies extended during the interview of October 14, 2005. The Amendments discussed during the interview have been presented above and the arguments made are repeated herein for the record.

Claims 5-6 and 11-15 remain pending.

Claims 13 and 15 were rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 13 has been revised above for clarity. In this regard, as illustrated for example in Figure 1 and explained in the specification at page 17, lines 21-23, the detecting portion is on the inner circumferential side of the bearing 8. This feature of the invention was recited in original claim 13, but perhaps more awkwardly referred to "the center side of an axis rather than a bearing portion". Even though claim 13 was not objected to as lacking clarity, it was revised in response to the first Official Action to more clearly provide that the detecting portion is placed at or adjacent the center axis of the bearing portion. Since the Examiner was apparently concerned that this language was not identically presented in the original specification, claim 13 has been revised for clarity to refer to the fact that the detection portion is placed at "an inner circumferential side" of the bearing portion which corresponds to the language used on page 17. As apparently understood by the Examiner, because claim 13 was not rejected over the prior art, the detecting portion in accordance with claim 13 is placed inside the bearing portion. The cited patent to Onodera provides part 5a of the rotor inside the bearing portion and provides the detecting portion 4a outside the bearing

portion. Thus, Onodera clearly does not anticipate nor render obvious claim 13. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, and allowance of claims 13 and 15 is solicited.

Claims 1-2, 9-10 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Onodera. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. However, to advance prosecution, claims 1-2 and 9-10 have been canceled and claims 5 and 6 have been rewritten in independent form as previously indicated allowable.

Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's indication that claims 5-6 and 11-12 contain allowable subject matter and that claim 14 is allowed.

As noted above, claims 5-6 have been presented in independent form as indicated allowable and claims 11-12 depend therefrom. It is therefore respectfully submitted that claims 5-6 and 11-15 should all now be allowed. If, however, there are any formal matters or issues that remain outstanding, it is respectfully requested that the undersigned be contacted so that such matters can be promptly resolved.

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and an early Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: 
Michelle N. Lester
Reg. No. 32,331

MNL:slj
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100